

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 10-12, and 15 are amended and claims 16-27 are added herein.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 16 are independent.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, and 15 are amended to eliminate means-plus-function recitals and for clarification. As will be discussed in detail below, the amendments are not made for purposes of patentability. Claims 16-27 are added to recite the invention in a somewhat different manner.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Walker (US 6,110,041). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of independent claims 1, 4, 8, 11, and 15 requires receipt or calculating of data of a total game result achieved by the first gaming machine and the second gaming machine, determination of a specification value based on the total game result data, and renewing to replace a set specification value with, or transmitting, the determined specification value.

Thus, each of the independent claims has the characteristic features that games are jointly played with two gaming machines and a total result of the jointly played games is used to determine a specification value for the game played on one of the gaming machines, e.g. to replace a currently set specification value on that gaming machine. It is respectfully submitted that Walker lacks any teaching or limitation of such limitations. Indeed Walker neither teaches nor suggests that games be jointly played with two gaming machines or that a total result of the jointly played games be used to determine a specification value, let alone to determine a specification value that is used to replace a currently set specification value on one of the gaming machines.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of independent claims 1, 4, 8, 11, and 15 and 16, and its dependencies, patentably distinguishes over the applied prior art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New independent claim 16 requires that a total game result be determined based on a first game result from prior play of a game on the first gaming

machine and a second game result from prior play of a game on a second gaming machine. Also required is that a value associated with an award obtainable based on a game result from subsequent play of a game on a first gaming machine be set in accordance with the determined total game result.

Hence, what is required is that the total of the results from prior play of games two gaming machines be used to set a value associated with an award obtainable based on a game result from later play of a game on one of the gaming machines.

As discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that Walker lacks any teaching or suggestion of determining a total game result based on a first game result from prior play of a game on the first gaming machine and a second game result from prior play of a game on a second gaming machine. Hence, Walker necessarily lacks setting a value associated with an award obtainable based on a game result from subsequent play of a game on a first gaming machine in accordance with such a determined total game result.

Additionally, other features recited in the dependent claims further distinguish over the applied Walker reference. Such features include, for example:

The claim 17 requirement that the value associated with the obtainable award be one of (i) a probability associated with an obtainable big prize payout, (ii) an amount associated with an obtainable regular payout based on a game result from subsequent play of a game on the first gaming machine and a game result from subsequent play of a game on the second gaming machine, and (iii) a rate associated with the obtainable regular payout.

The claim 21 requirement that setting the value includes modifying a prior value associated with the award obtainable based on the game result from the prior play of the game on the first gaming machine and that the prior value is modified to be (i) less favorable to a player of the first game machine, if an amount of the determined total game result is less than a threshold amount, and (ii) more favorable to the player of the first game machine, if the amount of the determined total game result is more than the threshold amount.

The claim 22 requirement that the threshold amount is a highest amount of a range of amounts extending from a lowest amount of the range to the highest amount, and that the prior value is modified to be less favorable to the player of the first game machine if the amount of the determined total game result is within the range of amounts.

The claim 24 requirement that the second gaming machine is selected by the first gaming machine in accordance with a predefined selection criteria.

The claim 25 requirement that the selection of the second gaming machine be by a player of the first gaming machine and be accepted by a player of the second gaming machine prior to determining the total game result, and that the determining be performed based on the player of the second gaming machine accepting the selection of the second gaming machine.

The claim 26 requirement that the value associated with the award obtainable based on the game result from subsequent play of a game on the first gaming machine [as recited in claim 16] be a first value, and that a second value associated with an award obtainable based on a game result from subsequent play of a game on the second gaming machine be set in accordance with the determined total game result.

The claim 27 requirement that a table including predefined different values associated with the award obtainable based on different game results from play of a game on the first gaming machine be stored for different total game results, and that the value associated with the award obtainable based on the game result from subsequent play of a game on the first gaming machine [as recited in claim 16] is set also in accordance with the stored table.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed local telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any remaining issues and further to expedite passage of the application to issue, if any further comments, questions or suggestions arise in

Docket No. 3022-0022  
File No. 1227.43224X00  
Client No. ARF-0034US  
Applicant's Ref. P02-0536US  
connection with the application.

PATENT

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 1227.43224X00) and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

/Alfred A. Stadnicki/

Alfred A. Stadnicki  
Registration No. 30,226

1300 North Seventeenth Street  
Suite 1800  
Arlington, VA 22209  
Tel.: 703-312-6600  
Fax.: 703-312-6666

AAS/kbl